UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Farmer's Way Out

By Arthur E. Holt

We and Our World - - - *Jesse H. Holmes*

A Crime Against Modern History
- - - - - - - - - - *J. T. Sunderland*

The Pact of Rome - - - - *Taraknath Das*

Prison Conditions in Hungary
- - - - - - - - - *Frederick Hankinson*

VOLUME CXIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, April 30, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 85

ARTICLES—
The Farmer's Way Out—ARTHUR E. HOLT 86
We and Our World—JESSE H. HOLMES 87
A Crime Against Modern History—J. T. SUNDERLAND 93
The Pact of Rome—TARAKNATH DAS 95

POETRY—
The Wise—JOHN DRINKWATER 83
Gold—GEORGIANA BOLE KING 92
To Certain Former Friends—ELIOT WHITE 92

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Defense of Poetry—HARRY ELMORE HURD 97
The Lesson of Russia—LUCIA AMES MEAD 98

CORRESPONDENCE—
Seminar in Mexico—HUBERT C. HERRING 99
The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation—ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN 99
The Codex Sinaiticus—MAGGS BROTHERS 99

THE FIELD—
Prison Conditions in Hungary—FREDERICK HANKINSON 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Prison Conditions in Hungary

[From Our Special Correspondent]

For the past fourteen years, during which time Hungary endured the tragic end of the War, the Republic, the Communism and the Counter-Revolution, all of which caused upheavals in the settled state of government and society, there has been a steady progress in prison reform, in the speeding up of the trials in the law courts, in humanitarianism concerning prisoners and especially in the more tolerant public opinion regarding prisons and prisoners. After Communism ended and Hungary became a kingdom again in 1919, every public institution seemed broken down, the old order and system were shattered, and at this time the general public had no sympathy whatever for prisoners; thus it reflects great credit on the state officials who have slowly and surely brought back law and order once more, and educated the general public to realize that the prison system is a part of the state and must be humane and disciplined.

There have been great improvements in the sanitary systems in the prisons, overcrowding is almost unknown now, lighting and heating of cells are adequate, the hospital treatment and care of the invalids are greatly improved, and wherever possible work for prisoners is carried on by means of farming, factory work or handicraft.

Capital Punishment exists in Hungary for murder, both for male and female, but the prisoner is generally sentenced to lifelong imprisonment. The average hanging is about one or two cases yearly, in spite of the most gruesome murders which appear in this after-war period in all European lands. Even such sentences are rarely carried out to the letter of the law, and prisoners of good conduct are released after fifteen years, first under ticket of leave for four years, and then are free if no new offense against the law is committed.

Flogging was done away with in 1871. Flogging when actually in prison is against the law and not known, and it was a great surprise to learn here that it was being used

(*Continued on page* 100)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIII MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1934 Number 5

THE WISE

Wise of the storied ages we,
Of perils dared and crosses borne,
Of heroes bound by no decree
Of laws defiled or faiths outworn,
Of poets who have held in scorn
All mean and tyrannous things that be;
We prophesy with lips that sped
The songs of the prophetic dead.

Wise of the great unshapen age,
To which we move with measured tread
All girt with passionate truth to wage
High battle for the word unsaid,
The song unsung, the cause unled,
The freedom that no hope can gauge;
Strong-armed, sure-footed, iron-willed
We sift and weave, we break and build.

Into one hour we gather all
The years gone down, the years unwrought.
Upon our ears brave measures fall
Across uncharted spaces brought,
Upon our lips the words are caught
Wherewith the dead the unborn call;
From love to love, from height to height
We press and none may curb our might.

JOHN DRINKWATER.

Hitler, threatened by a successful boycott against his regime, is said to be in favor of letting up on the Jews a bit. But does Adolf imagine that a relaxation of his anti-Semitic war is going to bring him peace? If so, he misses two highly important points in the present set-up. Thus, in the first place, the boycott is not in any sense a Jewish movement merely. The Jews were the first to declare a boycott, and have been most active in extending and sustaining it. But the world of labor is just as completely organized in attack upon the Nazis, and allies in vast numbers are to be found in the ranks of all enlightened, intelligent, and liberal people. No such successful boycott could be the work of one group alone. It is successful because behind it is the outraged conscience of mankind. In the second place, why should Hitler imagine that the Jews, in this or any other country, can be placated by a suspension of the war against themselves? These Jews have never been fighting merely in their own defense. Always have they recognized that they were only one of a considerable number of minority groups which have together fallen under the whip and sword of Nazi tyranny. If they are relieved, then others must be relieved—the pacifists, the Socialists, the Communists, the Protestants! If these latter are *not* relieved, then regardless of clemency bestowed, the Jews must and will continue their opposition to the Brown Shirt reign of terror. There can be no cessation of the boycott, or of other attack upon the third Reich, until Hitler's regime itself has ceased. What "der Fuehrer" needs to learn is that the world is in revolt not against this or that item of his program, anti-Semitism or any other, but against all that he stands for as a movement aimed straight against civilization itself. Germany under Hitler is an outlawed land, and will remain so until it has freed itself of the Nazi shackles.

What is fundamentally wrong with the New Deal is clearly revealed in the amazing report from the U. S. Treasury that the year 1933 showed a decline in small taxable incomes (below $5,000), and a substantial increase in large taxable incomes (above $5,000), and a still larger increase in corporation earnings. For a long time there has been a good deal of mystery about what was actually happening in this recovery campaign. Business was obviously improving in certain lines, more money was actually circulating, signs of returning prosperity were plainly multiplying, and yet purchasing power was as small as ever, unemployment (apart from the CWA) was not decreasing, and the great masses of the people were still miserable. President Roosevelt seemed to be succeeding in everything except what was alone important—namely, the return of prosperity to the common man! Now the explanation has come, the mystery is cleared away. These initial tax reports, which cover no less than nine months of the New Deal, demonstrate conclusively that all the gain is along the old disastrous

lines—more money to the rich, and less money to the poor. People above the $5,000 mark are waxing fat again, but those below this mark are growing leaner than ever. Corporations? they are doing fine, thank you, but wage-earners? not so good! Oh, yes, wages have been increased. But so have prices! A 10 per cent increase in wages of steel workers and automobile operatives, and an immediate 15 and 20 per cent increase in prices to the consumer! Fine work, Mr. Roosevelt! Aggravating our ailment of inequitable distribution, while cutting down production, raising the cost of living, and impoverishing the poor. The President's smile is apparently unquenchable, and the ballyhoo of the administration inextinguishable. But *let them laugh this off!*

If Fascism comes in this country, it won't be because of anything that the Fascists themselves are doing to win their cause. We marvel, indeed, that these Fascists among us should imagine it necessary to do anything, when democracy is every day giving proof of its inability or unwillingness to function. If European experience teaches any lesson, it is that Fascism has risen to power only as fast and as far as democracy has fallen into "innocuous desuetude." And look, now, at what is happening, or not happening at all, here in America! In New York City there is an able and honest Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia, elected by the votes of determined citizens to clean out the corruption of Tammany and establish efficient government. He has been in office something over a hundred days, and every day of that hundred he has been frustrated, thwarted, hampered, hindered, by executives, aldermen, district attorneys, legislators, who have held any modicum of power to use against him. Mr. La Guardia is not being allowed to function, except at a cost of concession and compromise which may in the end be ruinous. In Albany, there is a Legislature dominated by politics and rife with corruption. Recent revelations have shown relations between legislators and public utility corporations which make impossible any real service of public need. These "representatives of the people" invariably think last and least of the people. In Washington, we have a Congress utterly subservient to the Veterans' Lobby, forfeiting every public interest to the purely private interest of an organized and utterly selfish minority. And look at the Senate—confessedly incompetent to handle even so silly an ill as the unspeakable Huey Long! If the Senate can't lance that boil and get rid of it, how can it be expected to achieve anything? This democracy of ours is in a bad way, no doubt about it. Let this sort of thing go on, and Fascism will be our inevitable damnation.

How easily we go to pieces morally, once we get started! The desire to get hold of the profits of the bootleggers, and thus help out taxes, was one of the prime reasons why Prohibition was repealed. It was so simple a way of getting money—going into the bootlegger's business and pocketing his gains! Now, as another easy and obvious step, the government is going into the gambling business. New Hampshire has already legalized betting on horse racing (for a share of the profits), staid old Massachusetts is now proposing to do the same and New York likewise. If a bootlegger, why not a bookmaker? The business, to be sure, is disreputable, but—there's money in it, and of course that's everything. But this is not the end! The lottery is on the horizon. Thus, a House committee of the Massachusetts General Court has voted 7 to 4 in favor of a lottery system to be operated by the state, with drawings permissible as often as once a month. Not to be outdone, New York is considering a lottery bill, by which the city hopes to obtain as much as $10,000,000 a year for public purposes. But why stop here? Why not keep right on legalizing any debauchery or vice which promises the boon of profits? The drug traffic, for example—there's millions in it! This illicit trade reaps enormous gains every year. Let the government take over the business, and produce its own dope fiends! And prostitution—think of the money in *that!* Come, come, why be finicky? Get your women, open your houses, and charge a good, stiff price for fornication! And kidnapping—think of it! Two hundred thousand dollars at a lick! Bootleggers and bookmakers are mere pikers compared to kidnappers. Put the government into the business of stealing Lindbergh babies, and all taxes can be repealed. Say, boy, we did something when we took over the bootleggers! Let's go the "whole hog" and be really prosperous!

The Insull drama was first a comedy, then a farce, and now at last a good deal of a tragedy. We don't know but what it has been from the beginning a tragedy. Certainly a tragedy for the hundreds of thousands—or is it millions?—of men and women whose money Insull used to profit his own exchequer, and in the end wantonly sacrificed to save the remnant of his own fortune! A tragedy also for the old man who had not the character to face with dignity his vast disaster, but fled like the most arrant coward when trouble gathered! And a tragedy now for everybody, that we must go through this miserable fiasco to the end, with no chance of helping anybody, and with only the horrible necessity of wreaking vengeance to no useful purpose! It is when we get to such a point as we have now reached in this Insull case, that we see the

futility of a system of justice based upon the idea of punishment. Yet there *are* some personages in this drama that we confess we would like to see punished, now that punishment is being passed around. Those officials in Greece, for example, who disgraced their nation by allowing a wealthy fugitive to bribe them into compliance with his conspiracy! Those physicians in Greece who, quite after the model of their American colleagues, dishonored their profession by inventing illnesses of the flesh as a means of defeating the operations of the law! Those lawyers in Athens and Istanbul who in return for money received, erected every imaginable legal obstacle to defeat the purpose of the United States to reclaim its recreant citizen! And now that Insull is coming home, what American officials, physicians, lawyers, will join this company of renegades? Yes, it *is* a tragedy—and a crime!

War produced the depression, and now the depression is again producing war. At least it is pushing the preparation for war to the point where armed conflict would seem to be unavoidable. The excuse is unemployment, and the curing of it by setting men to work in militaristic projects—as though there were not countless other projects which use just as much raw material and keep just as many men busy! The trend began with the CCC, which took over hundreds of thousands of idle young men, and placed them in charge of army officers, who promptly established military discipline and drill. Then came the Vinson naval bill, in which President Roosevelt found satisfaction for his lust of arms in outrageous proposals for the vast enlargement of our navy. Now appears the latest proposal—to authorize the PWA to construct fifty new armories for ROTC units in as many colleges! The April bulletin of the vigilant Committee on Militarism in Education (2929 Broadway, New York City) exposes the details of this crazy idea. The fifty armories would cost approximately $400,000 each, which insures a wasteful expenditure (the national ideal these days!) of "only $20,000,000." This money, we are told, would go 80 per cent to wages for workers, and 20 per cent to purchase of materials (no profits to the contractors on the job? well, well, well!!). The colleges, of course, are already grabbing for the swag—anything for a grand new building! Thus, President Clothier, of Rutgers, steps right up to the bargain-counter and says he'll take one. Penn State and Wisconsin are favorably debating the proposition. Meanwhile, with $20,000,000 thus to be worse than wasted, our whole great system of public education is going to pieces. Nearly 2,000 rural schools in 24 states failed to open last fall; a total of 2,280,000 school children between 6 and 15 years of age are not in school this year; 200,000 certified teachers are unemployed; one out of every four employed is earning less than $750 per year. All for lack of money! Millions for armories, but not one cent for education. If that's what PWA means, smash it!

Jottings

On April 1st last, the relief figures of the country reached the highest point since the depression began. There were more people unemployed and helpless on that date than on March 4th a year ago. This tremendous fact may be interpreted in either one of two ways: If you are pro-Roosevelt you say —Think of what the figures would have been, had it not been for the NRA! If you are anti-Roosevelt, you say—So this is all the NRA has accomplished in all this time!

It's amazing when you come to think of it—that the country has got to survive, from now until next fall, with Father Coughlin off the air. How shall we know what to do or think, with that great voice silent?

Anti-war demonstrations on April 14th last in the schools and colleges of the country were accompanied by rioting and bloodshed. Thus does the cause of peace march on!

Richard Neff, 16-year-old high school boy, occupied the official chair of Governor McNutt, of Indiana, in celebration of National Boy Scout Week. Asked what he thought of the Dillinger case, this model youth replied, "I'm for him." Thus do we educate our rising generation! Thus do newspapers, movies, radios do their perfect work!

Senator Pat Harrison declares that Senator Huey Long is "the least respected man in the Senate." True, too true! But what a dreadful thing to say of any man!

The retiring American minister to Austria has announced that Dollfuss acted with "admirable discretion" in the recent battle against the Socialists of Vienna. The comforting assurance of this remark is alas quite nullified by the ghastly thought of what would have been done in Vienna had Dollfuss lost his "discretion."

J. H .H.

Proposed Roads to a Better Social Order

2. The Farmer's Way Out

It is becoming increasingly evident that the salvation of rural America does not lie in improving church methods. There is no citizen of the United States who is so likely to maintain a church as the farmer if he has income enough to support one. Of course, no human being with limited means ought to be asked to support our present expensive Protestant ecclesiastical economy, but change this system as we will, we offer little relief to a man with an income which leaves him only a few dollars to spend on cultural advancement.

By their noblest traditions the American people are dedicated to the pursuit of freedom. In religion and politics there has been notable achievement. In the realm of economic life her achievement lags.

Three hundred years of American history have left us with the economic resources of the country in the control of a small minority. This concentration of wealth thwarts both political and religious liberty. The epoch which has passed ended with the world war. The sea-trader economy with which Protestantism had had a working alliance for three hundred years had exploited the agricultural and labor resources of the world. Bankrupt in its moral leadership it disintegrated through its own self-generated animosities; it had brought prosperity to merchants and manufacturers, but left in poverty great masses of the people.

In formulating the platform of American liberalism there is a special need that justice shall be so broadly conceived as to include the welfare of the agrarian classes. Many of the slogans which pretend to be progressive hide a subtle selfishness which, while providing higher standards for urban classes, can only be secured at the expense of the rural producer of food and raw materials for manufacture.

Capitalistic production has looked across one bargaining counter and bargained for labor; it has looked across another and bargained for raw materials for the farmer. In both cases it has so maneuvered government policies with regard to immigration laws, customs, tariffs and currency rates as to help itself and to put at a disadvantage both labor and the farmer with whom it bargained.

Cities have wanted cheap and pure foods, and they have often secured this food by policies which threw the burden on the farmer rather than upon forces inside the city which have been more responsible for the high cost of living than the farmer.

Urban money lenders have loaned money to rural borrowers and have so manipulated currency rates as to put the borrower at a great disadvantage. The lenders of money have emphasized the duty of debt paying, but have not been conscientious about the way rural people are gotten into debt.

Our American land policy, coming down from homesteading days, has been individualistic and without relationship to the needs of a national economy. It has, however, this merit, that it was a gigantic experiment in the democratic ownership of land. Collective activity among American farmers must start from the standpoint of the democratically owned farm. Other nations may force their farmers into collective organization. America must work through voluntary organization to some kind of collective strength.

The Communist group now bidding for leadership in world economic life professes friendliness to the peasant, but it becomes increasingly clear that its policy thus far has succumbed to an urban proletariat's desire for cheap food and raw materials. It takes away from the farmer his hold upon his land and offers him membership in a collective whose products are disposed of at a price set by an urban proletariat.

Many are saying today that more efficient production through large scale farming will be the solution of our farm problem. But any scheme for industrialized farming must face the necessity of paying its full share of social burden by paying the wages of unionized farm hands, unemployment insurance and by its support of community institutions. It cannot be credited with being more efficient until it has paid these charges.

We are trying to operate under a system of economics which was developed in nineteeth century Europe. The system may have been adapted to the dense populations and scarcity of goods in nineteenth century Europe but it is not adapted to modern America with a highly developed productive system and an abundance of economic goods. In the same spirit with which America pulled away from the European political system in 1776 and set up a new form of government, she must now forsake the economics of scarcity and establish a new economics designed to provide all with plenty.

The main feature of this new economics shall be central scientific planning. Economic processes shall be controlled not by a mechanical and wasteful survival of the fittest but by conscious human direction—by planning-commissions composed of representatives of the respective economic groups who are experts in their field.

What would a planned system of production operated not for profit but for consumption have to say about agriculture? What is necessary to obtain security and equality for the American farmer? Let us suggest a six-point program.

1. The planning-commission would decide what percentage of our population the nation should maintain in agriculture. We have let the proportion drift from 90% to 30%. It would be shortsighted to let it drift to 10%. Perhaps the planning-commission would decide that for a balanced economy between 20% and 30% of the people should be maintained in agriculture.

2. We would address ourselves to the problem of land ownership. Our government which used to own the land sold it to farmer and private concerns at a nominal price. During the past few decades ownership has drifted rapidly from the farmers to the money lenders. This makes the position of the farmer less secure, less remunerative and less respectable. We must have a new plan of ownership which will grant to the farmer security of tenure and to the government power to plan either a transfer to public ownership with use and occupancy as only title, or a plan similar to the Danish plan through a form of the Frazier bill.

3. Our land resources would be classified according to their proper uses and would be restricted to those uses for which they were best adapted. At the present time thousands of acres of thin hilly land in the eastern and southern parts of the United States are being farmed at a loss while more fertile lands are left out of cultivation. The present free competition is helping bankrupt all who are involved. Since we will need more forests and recreational grounds in the future much of the thin hilly land should be reforested and taken out of competition with fertile lands.

4. As planning proceeds and farming is restricted to the areas best adapted to farming it will be advisable in some cases to enlarge the farms through the formation of production co-operatives for the more efficient use of machinery and the replacing of hand labor. The farm homes will be arranged into villages built around the school, church and recreation hall. In this way all farm families can enjoy the modern conveniences and social life now beyond their means.

5. Under this system of scientific planning the very important matter of prices could not be left to the whims of speculative exchanges as at present. Farm prices would be fixed by a scientific commission at levels to give the agricultural producers an income equal to that of other groups. This, of course, would call for a rigid control of production.

It is at this point that the present agricultural program comes closest to a program for the future—in its provisions for acreage control. The difference between the two is that under the above system of production for consumption to the end that all may have plenty, no reduction of output would be necessary at this time. The control would be for the purpose of preventing individuals from producing more than their share or the group from producing more than can be consumed.

The principles of farmers' co-operative associations fit in well with the program outlined above. Their continued development should be fostered.

6. In revising our antiquated tax system, which the farmer has found to be a thorn in the flesh, the guiding principles should be to levy in accordance with the ability to pay and for the purpose of distributing wealth and income more equitably. This would mean higher taxes on income and inheritances and lower property and sales taxes, and a transfer of the support of roads and schools to state and federal government.

This six-point program is one answer to the present agricultural crisis. It will not solve all problems—no single program will. It does face squarely the very evident fact that there is something fundamentally wrong with our agricultural policy. It proposes to meet basic weaknesses with basic changes. The program suggested is certainly no more extraordinary than the conditions it is designed to correct—hunger and want in the midst of plenty.

Such gross absurdities kindle in men and women a zeal for large and noble action. It is this spirit which characterizes the present hour, which accounts for the forward strides of recent months, the rapid rate at which we now move. It is this spirit which is turning from the blind drift of the past to planned action as outlined above to the end that our agricultural classes may yet have security and equality.

ARTHUR E. HOLT.*

*Professor of Social Ethics, Chicago Theological Seminary and Divinity School, University of Chicago.

We and Our World

I have no desire to raise the questions old and dark of materialism, idealism, agnosticism, or any other "isms." I suppose it may be assumed that, in practice, man lives in a world presented to him by his senses and organized by his mind: which is therefore in some sense a world of consciousness. I ask you, therefore, to review with me some of the elements of consciousness, with special reference to the making of our world.

Primitive consciousness—far down the scale of life—must have been a "dim, dreaming" experience, somewhat of the nature of the touch sense from which our other senses are derived. The parametium is a tiny creature, just below visibility for the unassisted eye. Watch him under the microscope; when he bumps up against a material wall; he stops, backs off a bit, turns through a small angle, and moves forward. If he is stopped again, he repeats until his way is open, when, as a parametium presumably isn't going anywhere in particular, he goes on in perfect satisfaction. We highly complicated beings have our wholly unconscious tropisms at times of sudden shock, and in unadapted, accidental motions generally. Reflexes carry us higher in that, though unconscious, they are adapted to our situations, while instincts are complicated groups of reflexes in which nature arranges animal conduct to meet average conditions. These are racial habits adapted to racial habitats; they fail of their purpose when the normal conditions of life are disarranged. A hen will "set" on door-knobs, a beaver will build a dam across a cage or a room, bees collect unlimited honey they will never use. Instincts are a great advance on mere tropisms; mere change of direction in time of crisis may save a few but certainly wastes multitudes of lives, so that nature is obliged to be extravagantly prodigal of life in these lower orders. Tennyson's "Nature," who "lends such evil dreams," is exceedingly moderate:

"So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life,
That I, considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And seeing that of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,"

for I venture to say that often of the millions of maple seeds from our streets of shade trees not one gets the chance even to sprout, let alone grow up

to be a tree. It has been calculated that the progeny of a single parametium at the ordinary rate of reproduction, and if none of them died, would in a score of years fill the solar system clear out to the orbit of Neptune. Instinct saves many more, no doubt; but it too is terribly wasteful and calls for a lavish fecundity to save a species from destruction. I understand it takes fifty thousand eggs annually from a pair of Boston's sacred cod to replace the annual catch.

So in these millions of years of experimentation in organization with the unstable hydro-carbons, Nature has been struggling to escape the stiffness and stupidity of the inorganic world, with its rigid "laws," its inevitable repetitions, and to invade the future with something like purpose and plan. Instinct builds the past into the future indeed, but finds it still inflexible, inelastic. It is tried out to amazing limits in the world of the social insects, and indeed is continued in decreasing measure in the higher vertebrates, as a marvelous new element for annexing the future appears and develops that curious and inexplicable thing we call mind—intelligence.

But in following this series—tropisms, reflexes, instincts, intellect—we have been ignoring the developing and varying responses in consciousness to our world contacts. All our senses are indeed touch senses; but with the growing complexity of the organism, touch divides and redivides into specialized touches running up to a dozen or more. Doubtless even the lowest of living things have some faint sense of heat and cold, light and darkness, ease and pain; but these and other experiences expand into a marvelous harp of the senses. In certain Radiates—star-fish, sea-urchins, jelly-fish—there appear spots especially sensitive to light. In molluscs higher up these sink in as pits, and ultimately, as in the cuttle-fish, a genuine eye appears with lens and retina. So also along other lines of life, running up through worm-like forms, through fish, reptiles and higher vertebrates, like eye-forms develop, sensitive to a narrow range of energy waves flowing in from the wide, wide world of space. Let us take note that all other senses than this and our vague and uncertain temperature sense are actually contact-senses, so that to sight alone we owe even the knowledge that there exist other worlds than our own little earth. Our sense for light is of exceedingly narrow range, confined to waves from ten thousand to twenty thousand per centimeter of length. If this were translated into sound terms, it would mean that our range of vision from red to violet is only a single octave of the light and energy scale. It is a well-known fact that these varied waves flowing in from all directions of space can be spread out by a prism, like the sticks of a fan, into a rainbow spectrum from red to violet. Less familiar is the fact that, though we are blind to it, the actual complete spectrum has no less than fifty times—perhaps a thousand times—the spread of the visible spectrum. Beyond the red end are heat rays, electro-magnetic rays, wireless telegraph and telephone waves, and longer waves not yet well enough known to be named at all. At the other end of the visible spectrum are successively ultra-violet rays, X-rays, gamma rays, and cosmic waves. The longest are miles in length, and the shortest can only be expressed by a dozen or more ciphers preceding the significant decimal. It is a familiar fact that as we sit here the lines of magnetic force are flowing north and south all about us without reaching our perceptions in any way. So also over and under us, on right and on left, and through and through us in every direction flow ceaselessly waves of cosmic power. Out of all this infinite variety our eyes seize upon a tiny few, make us pictures—and so we know! From this experience must we create our universal!

Our hearing sense also first appears here and there in spots on animal bodies—a stretched membrane on a grasshopper's abdomen, later stretched membranes in our inner ears tied up with various complexities of our nervous systems. Here is a grosser sense for waves of material air, by which we may know some of the affairs of the air-ocean in which we live and move and have our being. Its spectrum has a wider range; we can hear from a score of waves per second to a score of thousands—more than a dozen octaves instead of a single one. Many insects can hear shriller sounds and doubtless other animals still lower ones, while the range of sounds which to us are silence may well be a hundred-fold greater, expanding to the music of the spheres. Within the compass of our hearing is the world of music, of friendly voices, and that of alarms, of bugles, of cannonades.

Taste lets us know of a few things in solution, and smell of a few stray vapors; a dog's scent shows us what such feeble experiences might be, probably as vivid as our own sight; touch divides up into forms, pressures, temperatures, and pain, while the rest of the dozen or more senses which the psychologist now allows us are various modifications of those named above.

Here then we have our direct equipment for knowing and making our world. We are poised harps of these few strings—Nature touches them into light, color, sound, taste, and feeling, and we have our world in the making. In the making, and now to be made by these, plus our reactions to them, which as we have seen, have come a long and devious way. I suppose we have kept all the old forms of consciousness, but it is impossible to isolate and

recognize them. We may not enter into the consciousness of ants and bees, still less of infusoria and bacteria. Yet the empty consciousness we experience now and then between sleeping and waking is perhaps not too remote from the latter; and the blind drive of habit and custom which does so easily beset us is probably our nearest approach to the feel of instinctive conduct. And these remnants of our past are still powerful within us; we are not beings in an advanced stage. The million years of man is but as a night when it is past, and the few thousands of our civilization are mere seconds on the great world-clock. Those ever present but hidden instincts—unmeaning demands within us saying, "Do this though heavens fall!"—voices out of the dark, calling the roll of our footsteps—how they cling and hold us to our heritage from the beasts! Who says that nature—or God—is indifferent and leaves his growing world to accident? Certainly, however, these blind drives failed to work well enough; for they sink gradually to a secondary place as intelligence pursues, overtakes, passes and masters them.

Here then is our distinguishing characteristic: tropisms, reflexes and instincts we share with our humbler brethren, but mind in us has slowly lifted from faint beginnings to the commanding place it holds in many and should hold in all human lives. For it is here we annex the future to the past to make our present. Here life stretches forward and back ceasing to be a mere moving instant. We move in a new element, breathing a new and inspiring atmosphere. Yet, though the life-force drives us into it, the new element is nevertheless unwelcome. We are like the lowly amphibian who has reluctantly lifted himself from the water, where he has no weight and no need to breathe, into a new, painful world which stretches away to infinite distances, where his body is heavy and awkward, where he must gulp and swallow the illusive and invisible air or suffocate. What a joy to slip back into the smooth familiar element! What ease and comfort and rest! Why should he force himself to struggle out again into the new world of strain and stress? He does not know that he is at the threshold of a new world. How we hate to think! How harsh the new element, with its demand for effort and struggle, with its impalpable ideals and ghostly concepts! What delight to slip back easily into more conventional feeling, sustained by formal phrases, by habit, by custom and tradition. Yet we must go!

Once upon a time I took my school on a trip to the woods and streams. We were armed with buckets and baskets, with strainers, rakes and shovels; we brought back much plunder of many kinds for our museum, our aquarium, and for classroom study. One large, goggle-eyed grub established itself on a stalk under water among the turtles, tadpoles and fishes, settling down to a solitary and immobile existence for many days, so that we soon forgot all about it. But one morning as I came into the kindergarten I found an awed and open-eyed group of youngsters, watching a miracle; the ugly creature had crawled up the stalk into the air, had split open down the back and was slowly and painfully pulling its new self out of its old self—a dragon fly. Its body was cramped and strained, its wings were crumpled and soft, its weight which had been sustained by the water bore down the stalk on which it rested; about it was a new and dangerous world of lights and shadows and infinite distances. But soon its body straightened out, its wings dried and spread, and the twice-born insect angel was ready for a new and thrilling life in its new element.

We humans are only half out of our cocoons; the grub shell still partly encloses us. We shrink and draw back from the glare, from the tang and threat of the new element; but nature—or God—pushes us on to its conquest. We can no more return to our husk than can the dragon-fly, yet we long for the old days and the old ways, so easy, so comfortable, and half persuade ourselves that we can live as before. It is impossible henceforth; we must think or perish. We must breathe the thin, difficult, stimulating air of intelligence or suffocate.

It is easy to interpret intelligence too narrowly. It is not merely the capacity to reason accurately from established or accepted premises to necessary conclusions; a calculating machine can do as much. The world has suffered long and deeply from the effort to determine its order by Aristotelian logic acting on revealed and so inerrant premises. All this assumed an inevitable future which can be worked out by the same methods as the theorems of geometry. Such a world is a moving-picture house in the midst of a performance. The past is the spool of pictures already shown, the future the spool not yet unrolled; but those yet to come are all finished and will be drawn in inevitably by the motion of the film. A sufficiently acute intelligence, following the logical connection of the film material, could work either way, determining past and future with equal certainty. We have no good reason for believing at all in such a cut-and-dried world. On the contrary, nothing is so certain as uncertainty; premises and conclusions alike are based on probabilities, not on certainties, and in the attaining of ends the thinker has choice and active part. Intelligence is a tool for inventing, selecting, and building futures out of possibilties. Its function is not only that of understanding, but even more that of creating—which introduces two elements easily overlooked, without which mind is of very little consequence; these are vision and faith.

Our lives are lived forward—toward selected

ends; at each crisis, large or small, we set before us the various possibilities of the situation, we count the costs, consider the steps, estimate the values, and choose our way. Each choice is an adventure in living, not a problem in logic. It is by no means a mysterious or mystical experience, except as all life has in it the elements of mystery and mysticism. The Empire State Building had to exist as an idea, definite enough to be blue-printed, to be drawn in perspective, to have every beam and block of stone foreseen and numbered, before the excavations began for its foundations. Nehemiah had to see the new wall, and the new Jerusalem so vividly that he could make the Elders see them also before the said Elders cried out: "Let us rise up and build!" The founders of our Republic saw clearly—in mind—a new land of equality—of life, liberty, and opportunity—before that new land came to be possible!

Here then is vision; but Plato's bound and motionless men of the cave might have had vision. The prophetic vision of the Messianic Kingdom, Plato's Republic, Campanello's City of the Sun, Bacon's Lost Atlantis, More's Utopia, and many other visions are mere futility if no one has faith to try the adventure of making them real. Over and above the "things hoped for" must come the "substance of things not seen." Blue-prints without the will to create, vision without faith, are mere idle luxury of day-dreaming.

Thus and thus only is accomplished the building of worthy lives; in the process we meet the deepest and most essential of our world's revelation—the life values—the sense of those things we long for most genuinely and inevitably. This is, I think, what men mean or should mean, by "The Voice of God." We hear, "Behold!" and there is that within us which responds, "Let us rise up and build!" Here it seems to me is the essence of religion and the ultimate meaning of that central term, "God." We are dealing with the creative urge which binds us humans into unity, with the Supreme Imperative to obey which is the life more abundant, is salvation, is Heaven—to deny which is failure, is damnation, is Hell. We are forever invited and threatened; on the one hand is the call to creative life, to engage wholeheartedly in the task of making a nobler and a better world out of the world that is; on the other, the dry-as-dust existence of habit and custom, deterioration, death. He is indeed a fool who refuses to take the world as he finds it, but equally he is a failure who leaves it so. As sons of the dust we are drawn by earth's gravitation to join the clods and stones which lie where they are put and move only as they are moved. As sons of God we leave the ranks of static things and join the dynamic class of the makers; we cease to be materials and become builders. Yet we shrink from the promotion; it is so much easier to fall back into the ranks of rocks and hills; it is hard and dangerous to answer the challenge of the earth to step out and conquer it. As we realize how many trillions have accepted their heredity from the dust and dropped in their tracks, in comparison with the few hundreds or thousands who have chosen rather the sonship from above, we are moved to wonder at what has actually been achieved, and especially to stand awed and somewhat appalled at the upward swing of the curve of material progress in the few centuries just behind us. For in that time we have made the earth our own; its surface, a few miles above and a mile or so below, is indeed our own, "for we ourselves have said it." Any of our humbler brethren who may have disputed our title, we have exterminated or enslaved. Lions, tigers, wolves and the like exist only on our sufferance or are perhaps exhibited for our pleasure in circuses and zoos. Horses and cattle are chattel-slaves, dogs and cats are courtiers and jesters. A few recognized enemies remain, secret assassins like the poisonous serpents; bandits, robbers, and sneak-thieves, such as birds of prey, coyotes, rats and mice; but this is only because we are lazy, and careless of life, preferring to let them kill a few of us rather than to take the trouble to kill all of them. Our only serious antagonists are certain insects which now and then dispute with us the right to our various food products, and worst of all certain microbes which attempt to use us as food and lodging. But on the whole, we have little doubt that, having already conquered some of them, we will finish the job and oust the rest.

Disposing thus of all other claimants, we humans have taken control of the good ship earth, sailing cosmic seas. Starting a few thousands of years ago as mere strugglers for livelihood, wresting a meager existence from a reluctant soil, we have gone on from victory to victory in the conquest of the resistant forces of nature. Man has taken the whole earth—arctic, temperate, tropic. He makes his house of ice, of stone, of mud, of reeds. He wards off cold, or heat, or rain, or hail, or wind. He rides the land, the sea, the air. Long ago the prophet said, "the mountain shall be brought low and the valley lifted up, to make a highway." All this, spoken of as a miracle, is now a daily commonplace; wherever we want a highway among the hills we take the high tops and drop them into the low bottoms, and having paved the resulting levels we are ready "to go rapidly to places where we don't want to be, and come rapidly back again." Sun-power, earth-power, water-power, sky-power yield to us. They drag our cars, run our errands, light and heat our houses, carry our messages, build our homes, make our clothing. They sing and play for us, they talk and teach for us, they write and calculate for us, they cook and serve for us, they all but

think and live for us. Indeed they so far do our work for us that we do not know what to do with the labor of our hands, and are not unlikely to starve in the midst of plenty, because with machines doing our work for us we are of no further use and may well be relegated to the scrap-heap.

Moreover we look daily for another rub of the genie's lamp to loose for us the sub-molecular and sub-atomic energies, which may multiply a thousand-fold the power at our disposal. Will this result in none of us being needed for the world's work, and in our final extinction?

Which absurdity brings me back to that calm and somewhat arrogant assumption of ours, that the earth is our own—our own to what end? to what future? Why do we struggle for the powers of earth, sea and sky? Is it to make machines, to run machines, to make things, to keep us going to make more machines to make more things ad infinitum? Is it to accumulate wealth, while men decay? Here it seems to me is the crucial question of our civilization: we have shown that we can master the earth, but can we master ourselves?

What indeed are we? We know something of our world, but who are we that know it? We know something of the self, but who is the mysterious self who should master it? the self that should conquer the self? On the one hand is impulse, appetite and desire—hatred, avarice, selfishness; on the other, vision, faith, creative will: which are we? It is for man, and for each man, the parting of ways: he will continue to be mortal or he will put on immortality; he will be either the "old man" who is "of the earth, earthly" or he will be "the lord from Heaven." He who lives will be "I," Saul of Tarsus, or he will be "Christ" who "liveth in me." I am presenting no mere barren theology to be debated by barren logic; it is a practical problem of fact and choice about us. We choose to be either the beast-man, coerced by nature, or the God-man coercing and recreating nature. I have no interest in the pseudo-science which regards man as a mere automatic product of a mechanical world, a mere resultant of complex inter-acting forces. For one who accepts this opinion, that acceptance, together with faith, hope, love, and all other experiences, is no more than the grind of atoms and electrons; for him, truth, beauty, and all ideals, as well as his indignant denial of my statement, are no more than temporary arrangements of molecules. I believe a man may choose a self from the past or a self of the future; that he may elect to be an agglomeration of appetites and passions, or to be a vision and the will to make it real. And I believe that man has passed beyond the narrow boundaries of personal desires and has chosen to be a greater self with a greater heritage.

So here's our world and here's our equipment and here's our heritage. We haven't done too well with it so far, but we are green and raw. We have made terrible mistakes, but that's to the good, since we need not make them again. We have our vision, fairly outlined, partly blue-printed—now for faith and courage! Our vision is that of a world of more abundant life, not after death, not in a remote and stupid heaven, but here on the surface of this spinning, gravitating, evolving globe. Our forefathers saw this vision a century and a half ago; they rose to it, thrilled at it, died for it. Today we give it lip-service but fail miserably in building its substance into our lives and our institutions.

Equality, life, liberty, opportunity!

Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite!

What is equality? Certainly it is not equality of powers, of intellect, or of service to society. Probably half of our population at any given time is incapable of any service—the children, the sick, the criminals, the insane, the aged. Half of the remaining half, at least, perform services which cannot be estimated or compared—the mothers, the teachers and preachers, the authors and artists, the entertainers and organizers. And with the complex division of labor in our industry of today no one could determine the relative usefulness of the thousands who take essential part in almost every service. Those who wrote the Declaration of Independence were not stupid enough to suppose that any such equalities were or ever can be possible. The only possible or intelligible meaning has to do with some approach to equality in conditions of life, or incomes, of leisure, of comfort, of adjustment, of consideration. It must be a constantly renewed and inescapable equality. But our social and industrial systems are built on violent, irrational inequality. Our slogans of individualism, free competition, survival of the fittest, laissez faire, and the like, justify, exaggerate and glorify it. Our silly attitudes of racial and social and national superiority make it an offense and a crime that work out in wars, in depressions, in disasters. The only way out of it is that into genuine equality; nothing less than this allows liberty and fraternity. For lack of it, our civilization is destroying itself and, without it, will destroy itself; in very truth that destruction is on the way, is near, may be beyond our power to avert. Yet the vision and faithfulness to the vision may save us, and so great is that salvation that we must not lightly surrender it. No one should dare to arrogate to himself the special privilege, that he is excused from the use of all his powers to this great end. If he hides behind wealth, or family, or power of any kind—any accidental conditions which may relieve him from the direct pressure toward service in our common job—he is a coward and a shirker, a renegade, disloyal to his world and to his God. We have such among us, who use their fellowmen

for their own ends alone, shutting their minds to the greater selves they might be. It must be for such that death was invented—awkward but efficient—to remove them so that the world may go forward.

And how about liberty? Of course it does not mean that people may do as they please. The fact that we live closer and closer together necessarily limits our freedom in certain lines; yet that very drawing together has made possible a multitude of privileges that isolated folk could never have. Liberty is only possible in civilized society, for disciplined wills—for those who have substituted an intelligent self-government from within for a coercive government from without. It is impossible, when groups or nations try to enforce demands for the conduct of other groups or nations. The less must be subordinated to the greater, not by reducing the weak to servitude but by due recognition and adjustment. We are working for an interdependent humanity in which all kinds of powers and ability supplement one another instead of being used to oppose and cancel each other. We have done stupid things in the past, but it is past, and should never be again. Anyone who justifies, furthers, plans, or takes part in future wars is either a left-over of the brute-man, who knows no better, or is a traitor to mankind. We must of course reckon somewhat with the half-wits and morons which a clumsy heredity now and then drops in our laps, and with the tiger-man and ape-man who snarl and chatter in our midst, but it is not necessary to send them to congress or to allow them positions of leadership. I remember one of the ingenious crowd who are forever inventing perpetual motion, who told me that unlike all others, who were trying to get rid of friction, he was planning to run his machine by friction. So we have still those who would run our human machine by friction—by oppositions, by competition, by mutual struggle, by war; in which each man's powers are used against his neighbor's powers, so that they cancel each other and we get for mankind the difference instead of the sum.

The dull wit and the dull sight which look to the conquest of our man-world by a mankind divided against itself must be ignored, not followed. No quarreling, contending, self-seeking legion ever won victories.

We must end wars; and we must also end that all-penetrating, ever-present personal kind of war called competition, and its hideous comrade acquisitiveness, by which each is invited to be a repellent, snarling collector of heaps of possessions, suspiciously watching every one about, as possible competitors, tensely ready to grab from any one who may be careless about some loose property, or too weak to hold it if attacked. War and the struggle to be rich—these are twin devils, which must be exorcised, not by merely keeping them in check, but by casting them out with fasting and prayer. We must be born again, into that all-including higher life which is God, and being born again we may find ourselves in a new earth, which we may make into a new heaven; a material world adjusted to the needs of man; its mountains and valleys pierced here and there with broad, easy highways, but for the most part preserved in all their charm and beauty to be great parks and play grounds for our leisure hours; its broad and fertile fields supplying abundance without excessive labor. Poverty today is mere selfishness and stupidity—it can be abolished by distributing fairly to all, the food, shelter, convenience and beauty which we have learned to create so easily. No more wars, no more ugly struggles to get more than our share, no more hatreds, prejudices, meannesses. Liberty, equality, fraternity—shall we have them? Are we worthy? Who knows?

JESSE H. HOLMES.*

*Professor of Philosophy, Swarthmore College since 1900.

Gold

A miser counted his store of gold,
That was more than his bony hands could hold;
Counted over and over again,
Gold that has been the curse of men.

And over his head were the golden stars,
Capella, Venus, Neptune and Mars,
And under his feet the petaled gold
That buttercups and daisies hold.

But he had no eyes for such as these
Who sat with a strong-box on his knees,
And locked his door against the night
And the chance that his wealth take sudden flight.

Oh richer far is the beggar who
Finds the star the Wise Men knew,
And stoops to pick in the tangled wold
The yellow of the marigold.

GEORGIANA BOLE KING.

To Certain Former Friends

Since you must exile me from your regard
That once with its fair shining brought me joy,
I do implore you, make the doom less hard
By mode of Syracuse, that would employ
No such harsh ballots as the shells and sherds
Of Athens' ostracism. Only leaves
Of silvery olive, curved like breasts of birds,
Her petalism used. That soft ban grieves
Less sharply the expelled one. So pray cast
In your stern voting, not the shells rough-edged,
Of thoughts or words that wound the treasured past
And all the grace that vanished friendship pledged.
But let the mountain laurel or the rose
Provide your ballots for this banishment
With leaves whereon a green remembrance glows,
Or petals that the dawn its hue has lent
In token of our earliest fellowship.
So may the love refused in testing day
Endure your verdict at the gray urn's lip—
O take the gentler Syracusan way!

ELIOT WHITE.

A Crime Against Modern History

At last we possess, for the first time, adequate histories of British Rule from the side of the Indian people. This is a matter of great importance, not only for India but for the world.[1]

British rule in India is not something small or in a corner. Consisting as it has done, and does, of conquest, and for two centuries of the forced domination, of a great civilized nation, the second largest in the world, it is, in its very nature, one of the major, one of the most commanding and important sections of modern world history. Yet the anomaly exists, that that vast section of history has not been known, has not *been permitted to be known,* to the world, except from *one side,* and that the side of the *foreign conquerors and rulers.* The side of the *nation itself,* with its vast population, held in subjection by a foreign power for the aggrandizement and enrichment of that power, has been *suppressed,* as has been said, *has not been allowed to reach the world.*

One of the tragic features connected with bondage everywhere is the fact that the people held in subjection are deprived of a voice. All the channels of communication with the world are in the hands of the ruling power; the people, deprived of their freedom, have no means of letting their condition be known.

This has been conspicuously the case in India from the beginning of its bondage. Great Britain has had the ear of the world. All mail lines and telegraph lines have been, and are, under her control and subject to her censorship. She is great and powerful; everything that she sends out is accepted as true. On the other hand, India has control of no means of communication. Whenever anything reaches the world from her, it bears on it the stigma of a subject and therefore supposedly inferior people. Who could believe their word as opposed to that of the ruling and of course superior English people?

If an Indian scholar has written a book, how in his poverty could he get it published? And even if he has succeeded in getting it issued in his own country, as a rule it could go no further. He has had no means of getting it before the world. If it has contained matter which the government did not like, if it has revealed facts which the government did not wish to have known, it has been promptly suppressed; even the Indian people themselves have not been allowed to read it, much less those of other nations.

On the other hand, the British rulers of the country have flooded the world with books, as also with articles in the leading periodicals of all nations, giving their side of the Indian situation. The libraries of all countries have been, and are, full of these.

Of course, readers everywhere finding these, and finding practically nothing on the other side, have taken it for granted that the British picture is true, that India is not in bondage at all, but that British rule is a great boon to the Indian people, a great blessing, something which is lifting them up and gradually "civilizing" them, and, with all the rest, something which they like.

If readers in libraries and elsewhere could have had India's side put before them, they would have obtained a wholly different picture. They would have learned that India's bondage, like all other bondages in the world, is a bitter thing, that it is not only impoverishing and economically ruinous, but that it is intellectually and morally degrading, weakening; that it is destructive of the character of those held in subjection; that it tends inevitably to destroy their self-respect, their power of initiative, their power of self-direction, to create in them a slave-psychology, to rob them of incentive and hope in life. No injury that can be inflicted upon a people is more terrible than this.

These British misrepresentations concerning conditions in India would not be so bad if they stopped with British writings—with British books and periodicals. But they do not. Britain's great influence in the world carries them everywhere. And the fact that they are not contradicted tends to make everybody accept them as true. Edmund Burke once said in the British House of Commons: "If an idiot told me the same thing every day for a year, no matter how foolish or false it might be, and I heard nothing to the contrary, I suppose I should end by believing him."

The world believes these British misrepresentations of India because it has always been hearing them and has never heard them disputed.

I find these misrepresentations present, more or less fully, in nearly all our American literature regarding India. They are in our popular writings and general histories; they are in our college and school histories; worst of all, they are in our cyclopedias. I have examined them all, and have not found one that is free from serious British bias. The great and honored Encyclopaedia Britannica leads off, and our writers follow essentially in its track, even if not always consciously so. That is to say, every article on India, or on Britain's relations to India, even if stating individual facts accurately, is written from Britain's side, does not recognize that there is any other, and portrays everything from that standpoint.

It is as if all the information we were able to obtain (through histories and cyclopedias) of the conquest and spoliation of Italy by Austria and of Poland by Austria, Germany and Russia, came to us through authors belonging to the despoiling nations, in sympathy with their crime, and writing in a way to make it appear no crime. It is as if all the histories (and cyclopedia articles) possessed by the world, of the American Revolutionary War, were written from the British side to show that the British were right and the Americans wrong.

It is as if the world had never been able to obtain knowledge of the iniquitous African Slave Trade carried on by England and America, except through those who perpetrated its horrors, or those who furnished the money and grew rich by it.

It is as if the American people at large had never been permitted to obtain acquaintance with Slavery as it existed in Georgia, Alabama and Louisiana, except from the side of the slave-holders and their apologists who declared it a "divine institution."

1. "Rise of the Christian Power in India." By Major B. D. Basu of the British Indian Medical Service. Pp. 1011. Calcutta. Ramananda Chatterjee. 1931.
"India Under the British Crown." A continuation of the above. Pp. 570. Same author, same publisher. 1933.
"The Economic History of India," from The Rise of the British Power in 1757 to the Accession of Queen Victoria in 1837. By Romesh C. Dutt. Pp. 459. London. Kegan Paul. 1902.
"India in the Victorian Age." A continuation of the preceding. Pp. 628. Same author, same publisher. 1904.

Of course, the fact that the world has been thus deceived regarding the real nature and the effects on India of British rule; the fact that from the beginning of their career in India the British, as has been said, have had the ear of all nations, and have been able, through a hundred, a thousand, channels, to justify themselves, while the Indian people have had practically all avenues of utterance closed against them, making it impossible for their voice to be heard by many, if by any, beyond their fellow-sufferers by their side—of course these facts add much to the bitterness as well as the wrong of India's bondage.

Nor should it be overlooked that all of those other cases of bondage mentioned above, all of those other crimes against human freedom, combined, have been small, very small, compared with Britain's gigantic wrong, of subjugating and ruling by the power of the bayonet a great historic, civilized nation, containing a population equal to that of all the Americas, North, Central and South—one-fifth of the entire population of the globe.

Are these misrepresentations always to continue? Must the world remain forever deceived, forever ignorant of the *real* British rule in India, that is, British rule from the side of the people themselves who feel it and suffer it?

Fortunately, as said in the beginning of this article, at last something better is appearing; at last we are getting histories which tell the story from the side of the *bondman*, from the side of *"the toad under the harrow."*

The appearance of Mahatma Gandhi on the scene has done much. His extraordinary genius and character, the unprecedented hold he has obtained on the imagination, the love and the veneration of the Indian people, and the enormous following he has attracted in his daring and ethically noble movement to secure India's freedom by non-violent non-cooperation with the British government—these have called the attention of the world to India and its government by Great Britain, as it was never called before.

All this is very important. And yet, it is coming to be widely seen that it has not been enough. It has created very great admiration of Mahatma Gandhi, and profound sympathy with him in his self-sacrificing and unparalleled efforts to help his people. But, unfortunately, it has left almost wholly unanswered some of the deep questions, some of the vital questions which arise in the discussion of whether or not Britain should grant India self-rule—questions which are constantly emphasized by British writers—namely: Are the Indian people ready for self-government? Do they not need training for it, and is not England giving them exactly the training they require? With all its faults, is not British rule better than any they could give themselves? It is claimed that British rule has impoverished the Indian people. On the contrary, has it not increased their wealth? However imperfect that rule may have been in this particular or that, has it not been a great benefit to India, and will it not be a great benefit if continued for an indefinite future?

I say, these and such as these are the questions that Great Britain keeps constantly before the world, which thoughtful minds in America and all other nations want to find answers for, but which Mahatma Gandhi, with all his noble qualities, does not seem, to many minds, to have answered. Can they be answered?

India replies with practically a united voice, Yes! they not only *can be*, but they *are* answered, every one, and beyond denial or rebuttal *by the whole story of British rule, whenever that story is truthfully and daringly told, from the side of the Indian people.*

Is the story anywhere told? Yes, at last! The four books named at the beginning of this article tell it.

Let us look briefly at the books—first at those of Mr. Dutt, because his were the earliest in time. Mr. Romesh C. Dutt was a distinguished Indian statesman and scholar, living and doing his work late in the nineteenth century. Besides other high positions held by him, he was a member of the Legislative Council of the Province of Bengal, Finance Minister of the State of Baroda and Lecturer of University College, London. He wrote other works on Indian subjects, but the most important for our purpose are the two already mentioned, namely, his *"Economic History of India"*—from the Rise of the British Power in 1757 to the Accession of Queen Victoria in 1837, and his *"India in the Victorian Age."*

It should be clearly understood that these books are *economic* histories, *not political*. Of course, therefore, they do not cover the whole ground. But in their sphere they are in the highest degree important. They are luminous expositions of the effects of British rule in controlling and ruining India's finances and industries, in destroying her extensive manufactures in the interest of those of England, and in causing her famines and her present terrible poverty. They cannot be too highly praised for their accuracy and the fairness of their spirit.

But, as already suggested, economic history is not sufficient; the political history of India under British rule is even more important; indeed it is absolutely necessary for a full understanding of the economic history itself.

For this we must turn to the masterly historical work of the late Major B. D. Basu,[2] also mentioned at the beginning of this article. Major Basu, long connected with the British-Indian Medical Service, was a scholar of extraordinary attainments, who for more than forty years had devoted himself to the study of his country's political history since the coming of the British, under conditions which gave him full access to public records and documents, as well as much important assistance from other scholars.

His history is in two large volumes. The first, entitled *"Rise of the Christian Power in India"*—a book of more than 1,000 pages, richly illustrated—was published in 1931. It tells the story of the conquest of India and its administration by the British East India Company, from the company's organization in 1600 down to the surrender of its charter, and the transference of its vast Indian possessions to the direct government of the British Parliament, in 1858, at the close of the "Indian Mutiny." Major Basu's second volume, entitled, *"India Under the British Crown,"* a book of nearly 600 large pages, also richly illustrated, appeared at the beginning of 1933. It takes up the story where the earlier volume leaves off and brings it down to essentially the present time. Thus it covers the story of the *later* administration of India, *by the British Government itself*, through *Viceroys* appointed by *Parliament* and responsible to *Parliament*, as distinguished from the *earlier* administration of the coun-

2. Died in 1932.

try through *Governor Generals* appointed by and responsible only to the *East India Company*. In other words, the volume begins with the administration of Lord Canning, the Governor General, who found himself confronted with the difficult task of restoring tranquility after the Sepoy Mutiny, and traces the history of India, as seen and experienced by the Indian people, through the administrations of fourteen Viceroys, down to and including that of Lord Reading, which terminated in 1926.

Both these volumes of Major Basu, not only reveal in every part a care, patience and thoroughness of research that leave little or nothing to be desired, and a spirit of fairness and candor that everywhere impresses the reader, but they tell their story with a graphic clearness, a simple picturesqueness of style, and a forcefulness that grip and fascinate.

It was hoped by many that the transference of the Government of India from the British East India Company to Great Britain itself would result in closer and more sympathetic relations between England and India, and more freedom and justice to the Indian people. But the hope was not realized. The change in the *form* of the Government proved to be little more than a *mere* change of *form*. The spirit of the government remained essentially the same as under the East India Company, and the practical administration of affairs in India was carried on almost exactly as before. Indeed, in some respects conditions became worse as the result of this change of government from the East India Company. Under the former regime, the charter of the company had to be renewed every twenty years. This meant that once in two decades the Indian situation came before Parliament and the entire country for careful investigation. Under the new form of government, all this passed away. No provisions were made for future investigations, and, as a consequence, none was ever made except at very rare intervals when some alarming crisis arose. The government of India became more and more a cold, hard, self-centered and self-managing bureaucracy, removed farther and farther from the knowledge or real interest of the British people—as a fact their interest becoming less and less in the Indian people, and more and more confined to the one matter of holding India securely under British control, for Britain's advantage. Although the Indian people today are granted a considerable number of minor liberties and privileges of kinds that do not interfere with British interests, as a matter of fact the exploitation and impoverishment of the country goes on as remorselessly, and the tyrannies of the government are as bitter today as at any time in the past since the very first saturnalia of looting and outrages under Clive and Hastings. The story of all this is told by Dutt and especially by Basu, with a clearness, a fairness and a fullness of documentation which puts it beyond refutation.

Since the publication of the works of these two scholars, there can be no excuse whatever for writers on India, whether of histories or cyclopedia articles, for not giving the story of British rule *intelligently* and *justly*, from the *side of the Indian people* as well as from that of their *foreign rulers*. There is one obstacle in the way which should be removed. The histories of Mr. Dutt are published in England and therefore may easily be obtained by Americans; but those of Major Basu as yet are published only in India. The need is great for them also to be published in England, or, better still, in both England and America.

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

The Pact of Rome—A Turning Point in World Politics

I

March 17, 1934, will be regarded as one of the most significant dates in the history of Italian foreign relations. On this date Signor Mussolini, Chancellor Dollfuss of Austria, and General Gambos, Prime Minister of Hungary, signed a Three Power Pact—the Pact of Rome—which has been characterized as "an alliance of Italy, Austria and Hungary." Last year when the Four Power Pact was signed by Italy, Great Britain, Germany and France, it was hailed as a great victory of Italian diplomacy, and a success of the personal leadership of Signor Mussolini in the field of international politics. But the original draft of the Four Power Pact had to be modified, owing to French insistence of bringing it into harmony with the League of Nations. In actuality the Four Power Pact is of no vital importance, because it cannot be easily invoked in settling difficult problems of European politics. However, the Pact of Rome is a decided victory of Italian diplomacy, because it establishes Italian political leadership in Austria and Hungary.

The Pact contains three distinct protocols. The first protocol is of a political character. It has been characterized as an alliance, but it is rather a consultative pact of far-reaching character between Italy, Austria and Hungary, and it goes into immediate effect.

Its true significance may be estimated from the speech of Signor Mussolini, delivered in the Opera House of Rome on the 18th of March (the day after the signature of the Pact), before the Second Quinquennial Assembly of the leaders of the Fascist regime. In this speech, he made it clear that Italy will support Austria in every possible way to maintain her independence. He said:

> Directly the war (the World War) was finished we pursued a policy of friendship with Austria with a view to preserving her integrity and independence. We were alone in that policy for a long time. When things took a dramatic turn the others woke up, but we shall continue our original line of conduct. *Austria knows that she can count on us to help her defend her independence.*

This means that both England and France and possibly other Powers are in agreement with Italy regarding the question of preserving Austrian independence, and these Powers have agreed that Italy shall take the leadership in this question. One may say that Signor Mussolini, by signing the Pact of Rome and by his declaration quoted above, served a definite notice to Germany that any overt act on the part of Germany threatening Austrian independence will not be tolerated.

The spirit behind the political protocol of the Pact of Rome can be understood from the following comments published in the Italian press which generally echoes the views of the government. The *Popolo di Roma* says:

> Austria has regained the consciousness of historic mission. She knows that she has still a future and her own road to

travel. She has definitely emerged from the state of minority in which her condition of weakness at home and lack of friends abroad have kept her. *From now onwards there will be no longer an Austrian foreign policy, but in all problems which particularly interest Italy, Austria and Hungary there will be a great Italo-Austro-Hungary policy.* This seems to us to be the salient point of the present agreement and the starting point in an entirely new era in the history and policy of Danubian countries.

From this it becomes apparent that the political protocol of the Pact of Rome creates a new bloc of Powers—Italy, Austria and Hungary—in the Danubian area. It will follow a common foreign policy, as the Little Entente Powers do. But Signor Mussolini has declared that "the protocol does not preclude more ample collaboration with other countries." Furthermore, Signor Gayda, writing in the semi-official *Giornale d' Italia,* says:

No new situation is created by the agreement. The continuity of Mussolini's policy is reaffirmed. It does not constitute the formation of a new bloc. It follows the policy long advocated by Italy at Geneva. There is no intention of isolating Austria and Hungary from general Danubian problems.

From a careful study of the speech of Herr Hitler delivered in Munich on the 19th of March, as reported in the Times of the 21st, it becomes clear that the aim of the German revolution will not be completed *"until the unification of the German people was complete."* This means that Germany has not given up her aim of eventual Austro-German union. The press comment on the Pact of Rome, so far published in Germany, is not enthusiastically in its favor. Dr. Bensh supports Signor Mussolini's idea of Austrian independence but does not approve the Pact of Rome. The *Prager Press* and other papers from Little Entente countries are suspicious of the ulterior motive behind the pact. Bulgaria, as the *Mir* points out, welcomes Signor Mussolini's championing the revision of the Peace Treaty and acknowledges that Rome has become an important center regarding the Balkan politics. It is the general impression that this political protocol of the Pact of Rome is a check against German aspirations for absorbing Austria and at the same time a counter-poise to the political influence of the Little Entente and thus directly affecting France and her allies.

The second protocol is economic in character, and is based on the principles contained in the Danubian Memorandum presented by Italy under the date of September 29th, 1933, and "in harmony with the spirit of the decisions taken at the Stressa Conference."

The third protocol supplements the second one and emphasizes that before the 15th of May lists will be made for products which will receive special customs facilities and special concessions. It is understood that arrangements are being made so that Italy will allow Austria special privileges in the ports of Trieste and Fiume for export and import purposes. This is bound to hurt German ports of Hamburg and Bremen. It may on the other hand stimulate British export of coal to Austria. However the *Times* (London) of March 19 comments editorially that "Signor Mussolini must understand very well that even a much freer exchange of goods between Italy and the two Danubian States cannot restore prosperity unless the other Central European countries also come in with lowered barriers of trade."

II

The immediate effect of signing of the Pact of Rome will be bitter disappointment among a section of German statesmen who counted on full collaboration and eventual alliance between Germany and Italy. However, Germany, under the present situation of world politics, will not be in a position to take any action against Italy. Furthermore, she needs Italian support in her claims for her armament program. In fact, Signor Mussolini, on the day after the signing of the Pact of Rome, made a declaration in supporting German claims for rearmament. He said:

The armed states which were not disarming were not executing the fifth part of the Treaty of Versailles and they could not logically oppose the practical application of that parity of rights which was recognized to Germany in December, 1932. There were no alternatives. The claim to hold eternally disarmed a people like Germany was a pure illusion which would not be borne out by facts unless it was proposed to stop by force the eventual armament of Germany. But that would mean war—and the lives of millions and the whole destiny of Europe.

Signor Mussolini suggested the need for recognizing the German claims to rearmament with regard to effectives and defensive material on the basis of the signature of a convention proposed by Italy which would re-establish among European Powers, both great and small, that atmosphere of understanding, without which Europe is precipitating itself into darkness.—(Manchester *Guardian,* March 19, 1934.)

Mussolini's above declaration has various significance in extending support to Germany and opposing France on matters of disarmament. His attitude toward Germany is not merely due to the justice of the German claim, but helps Italy in safe-guarding her interests. By supporting Germany's claim to maintain para-military organizations of the type of Storm Troopers which, according to France have great value as military effectives, Italy maintains her position regarding her Fascist militia. Furthermore, moderate increase of the military power of Germany becomes a check against the superiority of French military power and that of her allies. If Germany, supported by Italy and probably by England, maintains her claims for rearmament, then there will be a serious tension between France and Germany; and on that occasion Italy, like England, will be able to play the role of a mediator.

One must not forget that, although the Franco-Italian relations are not as tense as they were a few months ago, there are many problems yet to be solved between the two nations. In this connection one should take into consideration what Signor Mussolini has to say regarding Franco-Italian relations of today and Italian expansion in Africa and the East. Il Duce declared on the 18th of March:

With France, our general relations have improved, but it must be said that none of the problems, large and small which have existed for 15 years have been solved. I must add, however, that the moral atmosphere is improved and that this must be considered a favorable condition for future developments.

Signor Mussolini really gave notice to the world that Italy will follow the policy of "peaceful penetration" in Africa, and expand economically, politically, and spiritually in Africa, without immediately annexing some sections of the continent. In this connection one may remember that, since the World War, Britain has ceded to Italy the territory of Jubaland, and used her influence over Egypt to grant Italy sovereignty over the oasis of Jerabub. Furthermore, through British support Italy has secured equal status with the British in the international zone of Tangier. Therefore, it is clear that the next objective for Italy is not only the solution of the Franco-Italian problems in

Africa, but further expansion in Africa. The diplomatic correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph,* commenting on the Italian demand, writes:

I should fancy, however, that Signor Mussolini was looking further afield than Tunisia, more specially in the economic field. He is probably eager to secure new outlets in Africa for Italian emigration and enterprise and an assured share in the raw materials available there of which Italy has great need. This need is presumably responsible for the Duce's reference to Asia as well as Africa.—(The *Daily Telegraph,* March 19, 1934.)

Germany accepts the outcome of the Pact of Rome because she is powerless to oppose it at the present time. But she will, in course of time, assert her position in Central Europe either by unmaking the Pact, or by creating a new alignment of Powers. It is quite apparent that, until the successful conclusion of the plebiscite in the Saar, Germany must preserve her friendly relations with Italy and Great Britain. Furthermore, Germany can not afford to do anything by which she might lose support of Great Britain and Italy in her present program of re-armament. While concentrating on these immediate issues, she is already busy in creating a German bloc of Powers. The signing of a pact between Germany and Poland, and Germany's efforts to establish most cordial political and commercial relations with Jugo-Slavia, are mere indications. In this connection one should notice that two days after the signing of the Pact of Rome General Goring, the Premier of Prussia, gave an interview to one of the correspondents of the *Le Jour* of Paris, pleading for a *Franco-German reapproachment.* He is reported to have concluded the interview with these words: *"Do you think that there is a single Power in the world which could resist the will of France and Germany combined?"* There was a time when some French statesman discussed with German leaders about the possibility of a Franco-German-Russian understanding; but fearing an Anglo-German-Italian combination against France, France has decided to be in closest possible relation with Russia, while attempting to revive the Anglo-French Entente. Therefore General Goring may not immediately have much success in his very interesting program of *Franco-German reapproachment.*

The signing of the Pact of Rome has not solved the problems of Central Europe. It is the beginning of a new era in European diplomacy. It may be the beginning of a new era for co-operation among nations, or may serve as an impetus for sharp rivalry among various factors—Italy-Austria-Hungary, the Little Entente Powers supported by France, Germany and Russia. It is certain that in any major development in Europe politics, or world politics, Britain will be involved merely to protect her own interests. However, the British Government is deeply interested in keeping itself free from any entanglement in Europe. Britain is more concerned about what might happen in the Pacific, as an outcome of the growing Anglo-Japanese rivalry. Similarly Russia is trying her best to strengthen her position without taking any active part in the developments in the Danubian region. Russia feels, in spite of German and Polish protestations, that if she becomes involved in serious difficulties in the Balkans or the Far East, she may be invaded by these two powers. Furthermore Russian statesmen feel that if Soviet Russia be entangled in a war in Europe, Japan may take advantage of that situation. Thus, to off-set any possible Polish-German combination against Russia, Russian statesmen are seeking support of France as well as Italy; and to offset Japanese pressure the Soviet Russian statesmen are seeking British as well as American support.

The signing of the Pact of Rome marks a new era in world politics. Italy, from this date, becomes an active and very important factor in the re-alignment of Powers. It is expected that Italy will follow her traditional policy of co-operation with Great Britain. But time will determine whether this Anglo-Italian co-operation would either develop into Anglo-Italian-German co-operation against France or it would develop into Anglo-French-Italian-Russian co-operation against a new, rejuvenated, and powerful Germany. Of all the great Powers, the United States of America and Japan are fortunately placed, and they can develop their independent foreign policy without being much influenced by rivalries among European Powers. They can follow a policy of "watchful waiting." However, they are vital factors in world politics, and they cannot be ignored by any real statesman while deciding upon a program of action.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Rome, Italy.

The Study Table

A Defense of Poetry

A great English poet vowed, "If there are any good wars, I shall attend them!" Those of us who know Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney always think of them as fighting in every *good* war. Like all true prophets, they plead for "a trial of the impractical" stuff of dreams and poetry as a *practical* solution of the deepest problems of life. They personify their definition of the poets as "the exclamation-points in human punctuation." Their plea for "more poetry in life" is a thunderbolt hurled at social and literary sham.

When Lucia Trent's "Children of Fire and Shadow" appeared, *The English Journal* proclaimed, "Lucia Trent need not write another line to make certain her shining immortality." *Fantasy* recently placed Ralph Cheyney "unquestionably in the first rank of America's lyric poets." A host of great writers have testified to their appreciation of this man and wife who reach a perfect synthesis in their cooperative authorship without surrendering their individualities, among them John Galsworthy, William Ellery Leonard and Lola Ridge. As editors of *Contemporary Verse,* managing editors of *Poetry World,* poetry editors of UNITY, editors of numerous anthologies and the foremost teachers of the craft of poetry in America, we may expect to find great wisdom in their first prose book, "More Power to Poets!"* We are not disappointed.

Not since the reviewer first read Sir Philip Sidney's "Defense of Poesy" has he discovered a volume so full of aphorisms which ought to be framed and posted on the walls of every poet's library. Here are a few picked at random. "The dreams of the poets are the blue-prints of the future." "Let the world be made safe for discontent." "The only orig-

*"MORE POWER TO POETS!—A Plea for More Poetry in Life, More Life in Poetry," by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney. Published by Henry Harrison, New York. $1.50.

inal sin is the sin of being unoriginal." "To label poetry is to libel it." Answering the all too popular conception, "The only good poet is a dead poet," these poets retort, "The only buried poets of much interest to us are those buried in living people."

If you are a poet, "More Power to Poets!" will make you proud of your profession. If you are a scoffer, you will be ashamed. It pleads for poetry with blood in its veins: "The true poet must be on the side of the rebel and heretic in any society, especially any economic dictatorship." There is little comfort in this book for the advocates of art for art's sake; there is less comfort for propagandists who substitute noise for beauty. It is not subject but treatment that determines the poet's place among the immortals. The poet's challenge, "If poetry is a criticism of life, as Matthew Arnold and our greatest critics have held, it should be a criticism of life as it is now lived." They affirm, "The voice of prophecy has not been hushed."

It is the contention of the authors that "Any subject can be made poetic. For poetry resides in the poet, not in the subject. Electric lights as well as stars, factory whistles as well as birds, jazz as well as the music of the spheres." Ralph Cheyney's "Pregnant Woman in a Lean Age" illustrates perfectly the power of poetry to lift an often taboo subject into the pristine light of beauty. A lesser poet would have soiled life's holiest fact. Whether one be thinking of propaganda or "poetic" subject, the distinction is always between poetry and verse. As the authors put it, "The difference between poetry and verse is a distinction of kind, not degree." Poetry is defined as "an attitude toward life, a reaching after that phase of living which lights our deepest moods, our union with all unutterable mystery." The entire book is a plea for poetic faith powerful enough to erect the "cities being built to music." We are reminded that the poet's altars "are not cash registers and time-clocks but human hearts."

We are also reminded that Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Shelley, Hood, Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Burns, John Davidson, Morris, Whitman, Hardy, Moody, Sterling, Swinburne, Symonds and Wilde are poets of social vision, and others less known are paid tribute.

Although "More Power to Poets!" is primarily addressed to poets and to those who wish to be informed concerning modern tendencies in poetry, it is also a philippic hurled against a civilization which values advertisements more than art, billboards more than beauty, and slogans more than social service. Without being didactic, this volume is a sermon. It is an indictment of a society which permits commercialism to pollute its songs and enshrines *Got* as god. If you are a poet and do not dare to have your pride punctured, do not read this book! If you are a reader who fears to face the truth, do not open "More Power to Poets!" If you are eager to learn from two of America's foremost poetic craftsmen the meaning of modernism and its challenge, you will be both informed and thrilled.

HARRY ELMORE HURD.

The Lesson of Russia

Sherwood Eddy's latest book* is not merely a narrative written from observation. It is a serious and most judicial and discriminating study of Marxian philosophy and the development of capitalism in America and a survey of the faults and follies of our own country and what we need to reform. The book was written in the home of the Dean of Canterbury last autumn after Mr. Eddy's tenth trip to Russia, two trips being under the Tsar's regime. The Dean, a man of broad sympathies, follows Mr. Eddy's foreword with a preface ending: "Seated more firmly in the saddle with each passing year, Russia can afford by degrees to relax and add to those new elements of morality which she possesses, the religion which she needs. We, on our part, setting our own house in order and learning from her what she has power to teach, may ourselves come nearer." Five years ago who would have thought of "mutual enrichment" and learning aught from "those atheistic bolshevists?"

Mr. Eddy's fifteen years in India, his repeated visits to China and Japan and all the European countries, guiding every summer a selected group of clergymen, editors and professors, have given him a marvelous opportunity to gain exceptional knowledge. His self-selected interpreters and freedom to leave the beaten track have carried him far outside the usual tourist line of travel. His frank arraignment of the bureaucratic octopus, the tyranny of an over-centralized collectivism, the merciless treatment of the kulaks, the ruthless class thinking and mass thinking are impressive, but not essentially new to the well-read American. What chiefly interests one is the new presentation of the Christian treatment of the child, the unpriviledged and the felon, provided that the latter sins only against individuals and does not so much as pick a flower from a public garden belonging to the State, any encroachment on the rights of the state being unpardonable.

Mr. Eddy shows in a disgraceful contrast our costly, pagan prisons from whence few emerge redeemed in character and the "houses of redemption" to which the delinquents in the U.S.S.R. are sent to learn, under normal conditions in the country, how to live and to retrieve themselves, which most of them do. He contrasts with these our lynchers, racketeers, and colossal number of criminals which have increased our prison population 50 per cent in six years, with "law enforcement agencies regarded as political plums."

Contrasted with so-called "Christian" America, atheistic Russia seems to have adopted a Christian policy regarding the treatment of the delinquent, the child and the unprivileged. Self-government is the aim of the school and home; to strike a child is criminal offense. "The workers and poor of all the world are held up as their field of sympathy and endeavor." Private property has been surrendered, but the family and home will never be abolished. There are now 50,000,000 children and adults in all educational institutions and extension classes: 90 per cent can now read and write. Women now, largely set free from kitchen drudgery, are doing their share in civic and cultural life. The spirit of youth dominates the land, 100,000,000 being under twenty-five years of age." A prostitute is looked upon with pity as a wreck from a capitalist civilization, but a profiteer is regarded with burning indignation.

*"Russia Today, What We Learn from Her," by Sherwood Eddy. Published by Farrar & Rinehart. $3.00.

The Soviet system appeals to the worker in a way closely akin to the old profit motive, but interest is enlisted for the common good, not for private gain. Our virgin continent, exploited by first comers and increasing its wealth in 80 years from 7 billion to 400 billion dollars, had less than a third of one per cent of the people paying over 95 per cent of individual income tax. In 1929 we had 513 multi-millionaires and one New Yorker had more than all the 600,000 dwellers in the slums. Legalized plundering of the public seemed ethical before 1929. Mr. Eddy is helping to open the eyes of the blind to see what it signifies when in 1932 wages in industry were only 28 per cent of those of 1926 and 1929 yet dividend and interest payments for the first nine months of 1932 were 64 per cent above those of 1926. Unemployment in Russia is completely eliminated and greater economic progress is being made than in any other nation, despite the present low standard of living and imperfection in quality of production.

Mr. Eddy's detailed presentation of the Soviet care of children, the encouragement of the drama, music, art, the outdoor sports, and dance, shows that the drab side of life with its hard work has an inspiring contrast in leisure hours, all planned, as are well-selected movies, to promote the public welfare. Children and youth are fed on Lenin and Marx—the Old and New Testaments of Communism—and thousands daily gaze on Lenin's embalmed body as they reverently file past it or join in solemn song, fifty thousand strong in the great stadium of Moscow.

Mr. Eddy's discriminating presentation of the Marxian doctrine, his frank acknowledgment of the failures of that nominal Christianity which for sixteen centuries after Constantine buttressed the war system, are among the most impressive pages of his book. He contrasts a Russia, aiming at justice but denying liberty, with the U. S., creating liberty but permitting the injustice of slums, waste, colossal crime and frightful unemployment. "Russia is in a temporary or transitional stage of state capitalism under a dictatorship that is rapidly building socialism." The working out of economic and social re-adjustment in a world of flux and rapid transition is the problem which the author treats in a wholly unbiased and Christian spirit as he surveys the two greatest nations of Europe and America. Perhaps no more useful study of vital social problems has been published in recent years.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Correspondence

Seminar in Mexico

Editor of UNITY:

May I, through your columns, call the attention of your readers to the ninth annual Seminar in Mexico? The sessions of the Seminar will be held in Cuarnavaca and Mexico City, from July 10th to July 30th, 1934. The Seminar continues to be a channel through which intelligent public opinion in the United States can be brought into contact with Mexican life and culture. This year's program will be an unusually varied and interesting enlargement of the scheme used so successfully in past years.

The Seminar will be built about round-table discussions in such fields as arts and crafts, economic and social problems, archaeology, music and the dance, inter-American relations, literature, history, the Mexican folk, and Indian education. Among the Mexican and American leaders who will participate are Rene d'Harnoncourt, Diego Rivera, Chester Lloyd Jones, Ramon Beteta, Herbert J. Spinden, Alfonso Caso, Carlos Chavez, Edwin M. Borchard, Elizabeth Wallace, Berta Gamboa de Camino, Robert Redfield, and others.

Applications for membership and requests for detailed information should be addressed to Hubert C. Herring, Executive Director, The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, 112 East 19th Street, New York City.

Foundation Invites Support

Editor of UNITY:

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation was incorporated in 1925 to administer a Fund bequeathed by the late Robert Schalkenbach, Head of the New York Typothetae, New York City, to further knowledge and understanding of the teachings of Henry George.

When it first began its work, the writings of Henry George, that is "Progress and Poverty," "Social Problems," "Protection or Free Trade," were out of print and unavailable. The Foundation has placed in publication some 40,000 books and has distributed them widely within the past few years. A nominal sum is asked for these publications, but the organization is purely educational, and does not publish for profit. A large correspondence is kept up with Henry George associations and groups throughout the world, and the Foundation is a headquarters for information on economic questions connected with the study of Henry George's famous book "Progress and Poverty."

It is served by twenty-one unpaid trustees, and the undersigned, paid executive secretary. Recently Mr. Henry George Atkinson, a grandson of Henry George —Mr. Albert Pleydell, formerly on the staff of the Citizen's Budget Committee, and Mr. Raymond V. McNally, were elected as trustees. Anna George deMille, daughter of Henry George, Frederic C. Howe, of the President's Agricultural Administration Board, and Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, president, are among the many prominent members of the Foundation's Board of Directors.

Those wishing to join in the activities of the Foundation should address the undersigned care of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 11 Park Place, New York.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN,
New York, N. Y. Executive Secretary.

The Codex Sinaiticus

Editor of UNITY:

We saw that you had a note in a recent issue concerning the purchase of the "Codex Sinaiticus," but no mention was made of through whom the purchase was made.

We think it will interest your readers to know that it was Maggs Bros., who suggested to the Russian government the sale of this manuscript and that we also were fortunate enough to interest the trustees of the British Museum in its purchase. As you know, £100,000 is the highest price ever paid for one single book or manuscript, and this is, of course, the most important book that has ever been sold.

London, England. MAGGS BROS.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

again in English Law Courts in quite recent years.

Punishment Cells. Personally, I dislike this form of solitary confinement in dark cells and also the use of chains for hands or feet, and would prefer a drastic system of extra hard work, cutting down of privileges such as smoking or attending any associated gathering, whether at meal or at work or in leisure time. The dark punishment cell and long solitary confinement only harden and embitter the prisoner.

Scientific Methods. There is no actual Borstal System here, but there are excellent agricultural and trade schools for youth, and domestic training and handicraft schools for girls. I have seen some very successful cases turned out who have got on in life and learned to be self-supporting and became reliable citizens and later happy parents during my fourteen years here.

In the long sentence prisons, a prisoner who has learned no trade may say, for instance, he will learn printing, weaving or furniture-making or she may say she will learn carpet-making or weaving and then he apprentices himself to that section of work which is carried on in the prison where he is incarcerated. Later on, when he feels he is master of his craft, a small group from the special trades union in the neighboring town come to the prison and hold an examination. If the man is successful he is given a printed certificate stating he is efficient in his trade and signed by the examiners, and no mention is made that the man was in prison. In a provincial town the leading furniture maker learned his trade in this way, as on entering the prison he had no trade or means of livelihood. Many instances can be given of men and women who, having a means of livelihood on release, have gone straight and never returned to prison, and some are today to my knowledge getting on in some trade or handicraft.

Sometimes in this agricultural land a prisoner may be a peasant or agricultural laborer who works his own few acres or large garden. Now, in the spring there is much work preparing the land and sowing the crops, and again in the autumn there is the reaping. Between the two seasons there is less pressure of work. A prisoner may, by special permission from the Minister of Justice, get leave to go to his home and work at the two busy seasons for a few weeks and then he must return and carry out the full term of his sentence. This humane principle helps to keep the family at home from want, and also retains the house and land in order for the time when the sentence is completed.

Payment. Prisoners also earn money when in convict prisons and sometimes a sum accumulates which enables the prisoner to begin life again. A portion may be sent to the family or used while in prison.

Prison Visitors. There are prison visitors in all prisons and Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish women may carry on the social work and this is very well organized in the prisons in the city of Budapest and other centers.

Newspapers. A fortnightly newspaper is printed in Budapest giving social, religious, political and literary items so that prisoners throughout the land know a little of what goes on in the outside world.

There are no experiments in *Self Government,* though in the prisons here there always seems more freedom for prisoners to move about in work or free time than in English or U. S. A. prisons. At the large farm colony at Hartar, about which I sent once a report, many prisoners seem almost as free as laborers on an ordinary farm. As this is called the "Prisoners' Paradise," practically all the prisoners wish to remain and any breach of order would return them to a walled-in institution. Escapes are rarely known.

Tuberculosis Treatment. At the provincial prison at Vacz on the Danube a specially equipped T. B. Sanatorium has lately been built on the Sarrasin System which is a model of its kind and the T. B. prisoners from the whole of the Hungarian prisons are sent there. It has sunny corridors, a large garden and everything needed for the cure and care of T. B. patients.

In the large prison at Kobanya on the outskirts of the city of Budapest there is a special Leanto Hall for very mild T. B. cases. The Hospital for Maternity cases is also at this prison and is for the whole of the country's prisoners and is very suitably equipped and well staffed with nurses, etc.

During the last two years the prisoners under arrest are brought before the judge much speedier than formerly and I heard from one Governor the only people regretting this are some of the lawyers.

FREDERICK HANKINSON.
Budapest, Hungary.

THE RELIGION OF SOLIDARITY

by

EDWARD BELLAMY

Through the kindness of Mrs. Bellamy, UNITY has the honor of printing this hitherto unpublished essay by the author of *Looking Backward and *Equality.***

Beginning in the issue of May 28, this early essay of Edward Bellamy will be published in three successive numbers of UNITY.

***A new edition has just been published by Houghton, Mifflin Company.**

SUBSCRIBE NOW
Special Subscription Offer—$1 for Six Months

To Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Ill.
Gentlemen:

Enclosed find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for six months.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

RATES:
$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription.